

In re: Hind et al.
Application No.: 09/765,127
Filed: January 17, 2001
Page 28

REMARKS

The Applicants appreciate the thorough examination of the present application that is reflected in the Office Action of January 25, 2005 (the "Action"). In response, the Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 25, and 49 to recite generally the recitations of Claims 11, 35 and 59, respectively.

In addition, Claims 1, 6-10, 12-22, 49, and 54-70 have been amended to remove "means for" terminology; and Claims 25, 30-34, 36-46 have been amended to remove "step" and/or "steps" terminology. The Applicants have also amended the specification to insert U.S. patent numbers and patent application numbers that are now available, and to change the term "voice recognition" to "speech recognition." The title has been amended to be more descriptive.

The Applicant will also show in the following remarks that all claims are patentable over the cited art. A Notice of Allowance is thus respectfully requested in due course.

Claim 1 is Patentable Over the Cited Art

As noted above, Claim 1 includes the general recitations of Claim 11. Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,640,145 to Hoffberg et al. ("Hoffberg") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0029350 to Cooper et al. ("Cooper"). In response, Applicants will show that Claim 1 is patentable for at least the reasons discussed below.

In particular, Claim 1 recites:

wherein the security core is configured to detect whether the audio recording component and the at least one transformation component remain operably connected to the security core during the recording and the transforming of the audio stream; and

wherein the security core is configured to abort the recording and the transforming if one or more of the audio recording component and the at least one transformation component fails to remain operably connected to the security core during the recording and the transforming of the audio stream.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least a security core that is configured to abort the

recording and the transforming if one or more of the audio recording component and the at least one transformation component fails to remain operably connected to the security core during the recording of the audio stream and the transforming of the audio stream.

The Action concedes that Hoffburg lacks these recitations. However, the Action states that Cooper discloses a web based network product that includes the above recitations, and cites page 5, paragraph 56 and page 13, paragraph 173 of Cooper.

Applicants respectfully disagree. In particular, the cited portions of Cooper merely discuss verifying the integrity of a file (Cooper, paragraph 56) and allowing a user to "abort the archiving process because of potential liability problems" (Cooper, paragraph 173).

In particular, Cooper discusses that an "expert or consultant may decide to either not archive any portion of the session or to the abort the archiving process because of potential liability problems." Cooper, paragraph 173. Accordingly, Cooper allows discretion of the user to decide whether or not to archive data. In contrast, Claim 1 recites that the security core is configured to abort the recording and the transforming when a condition is met, i.e., if one or more of the audio recording component and the at least one transformation component fails to remain operably connected to the security core during the recording of the audio stream and the transforming of the audio stream. Cooper proposes allowing the user discretion to abort a process, which teaches away from a security core that is configured to abort the recording and transforming of the data when one or more of the audio recording component and the transformation component fail to remain operably connected to the security core recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly the Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, the Applicants submit that Claims 25 and 49 are patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1. Moreover, Dependent Claims 2-10, 12-24, 26-34, 36-48, 50-58, and 60-71 are patentable at least as per the patentability of Claims 1, 25 and 49 from which they depend.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

It is not believed that an extension of time and/or additional fee(s)-including fees for net addition of claims-are required. In the event, however, that an extension of time is

In re: Hind et al.
Application No.: 09/765,127
Filed: January 17, 2001
Page 30

necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such an extension is hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a). Any additional fees believed to be due in connection with this paper may be charged to our Deposit Account 09-0461.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Laura M. Kelley", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Laura M. Kelley
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 48,441

USPTO Customer No. 46589
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec
Post Office Box 37428
Raleigh, North Carolina 27627
Telephone: 919/854-1400
Facsimile: 919/854-1401